

REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 21, 2005, has been received and carefully noted. The amendments made herein and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 7 and 8 have been amended, and new claims 11-15 has been added. Applicant submits that the new claims as well as the amendments made herein are fully supported in the specification and the drawings as originally filed, and therefore no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-15 are pending in the present application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Allowable Subject Matter and Allowed Claims

As a preliminary matter, Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2, 3 and 4 of the present application. Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 5, 6, 9 and 10.

Claim 1 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Green et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,881, hereinafter "Green"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites an information processing apparatus comprising, among other features, stopping means for shutting down said information processing

apparatus into an off-state without further searching another processor when said error is detected.

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of the Applicant's invention.

In making the rejection, the Office Action stated that the cited reference discloses "[T]he extra step of searching for a processor, as taught by Green."

In fact, it is submitted that Green discloses, "processor 31 [that] is initially designated as the boot processor at the time of the initial system reset. (Block 84). At this time, the timer 71 begins counting, and the boot processor attempts to boot the computer 30. If the boot processor 31 is operating correctly, it stops the timer 71 before it times out, and it boots the computer normally. (Block 86 and 88). However, if the boot processor 31 fails to boot the computer 30 before the timer 71 times out, the timer 71 delivers a signal to the control logic 64. In response to the signal from the timer 71, the control logic 64 delivers a signal on the bus 81 to the VRM 41 associated with the processor 31 to disconnect the processor's supply voltage delivered by the VRM 41, thus disabling the processor 31. Then, the system [of Green] resets and another boot processor is assigned from the remaining operable processors 32-38. (Blocks 92 and 94). This process repeats until an operable processor is able to boot the computer 30. (Blocks 86-94)" (Emphasis added). Column 5, lines 35-54.

In contrast, the present invention in one embodiment stops the power supply to the high-speed processor 12 and turns the entire system into an OFF-STATE without searching for another processor when an error is detected. For instance, the present

invention includes a stopping means for shutting down the information processing apparatus into an off-state without further searching another processor when an error is detected. Therefore, Applicant submits that Green fails to disclose each and every element recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Moreover, to qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single prior art reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, Green fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the disclosure of Green. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 7 and 8 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 recites a home-use game device comprising, among other features, a stopping means for shutting down said game device into an off-state without further searching another processor when said error is detected.

Claim 8 recites a home-use karaoke device comprising, among other features, a stopping means for shutting down said karaoke device into an off-state without further searching another processor when said error is detected.

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of the Applicant's invention.

As discussed above, Green merely discloses a system that resets after the first boot processor is inoperable, and assigns another boot processor from the remaining operable processors. This process repeats until an operable processor is able to boot the computer 100. In contrast, the present invention in another example shuts down the game device or the karaoke device into an OFF-STATE without searching for another processor when the error is detected. Therefore, Applicant submits that Green fails to disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claims 7 and 8 of the present application.

Moreover, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, each feature of a rejected claim must be taught or suggested by the applied art of record. See M.P.E.P. §2143.03 and *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974). As explained above, Green does not teach or suggest each feature recited by pending claims 7 and 8. Accordingly, for the above provided reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 7 and 8 are not rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by the teachings of Green, and are allowable.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

New Claims 11-15

New claims 11-15 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits that each of new claims 11, 12 and 13 includes the allowable subject matter recited in claim 2. In

other words, new claim 11 includes the subject matter recited in claim 1 and the allowable subject matter recited in claim 2; new claim 12 includes the subject matter recited in claim 7 and the allowable subject matter recited in claim 2; and new claim 13 includes the subject matter recited in claim 8 and the allowable subject matter recited in claim 2. Hence, claims 11-13 are allowable,

Claims 14-15 depend from claim 11, and therefore are also allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that each of claims 1, 7 and 8 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art. Applicant also submits that the subject matter is more than sufficient to render the claims non-obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, and therefore respectfully requests that claims 1-4, 7 and 8 be found allowable and that this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason, the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper has not been timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to

counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referring to client-matter number 100341-00016.

Respectfully submitted,



Sam Huang
Registration No. 48,430

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 857-6395

SH:ksm